



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

The first is simple and, to my mind, logical. The matter whose substance is to us unknown transforms itself around us, gradually, by processes of which we get sometimes a glimpse. We don't know why it does so, where it goes, if ever it has any end, but we know that all our knowledge, being finite, is not even a drop in the seas of the unknown. We try to learn the most of it and make the best of it—that's all. That is no explanation of our beginning and finalities, but we know that we cannot obtain that explanation.

The second hypothesis is much more complicated. For an infinity of time, an immaterial being has been living. We call him God. We suppose that He has almost all the qualities we share a little part of: science, power, etc. Then suddenly that Being creates the world. Why? I never had any answer for that "why." The most common one, that it was to give a field of experimentation to the human race and observe what would become of it, seems to me a ferocious joke. "A joke," because being God, He knew beforehand everything that would happen, and did not need the experience to prove it; and "ferocious," because that concept of human vanity, that man is the centre and motive of the universe on that pinhead we name earth, would make of Him a conceited coxcomb if things did not every day trample Him pitilessly. But let that "why" be for an instant unanswered. Do you think that this explanation of our origin, God, is better than the other? I see only that we merely change a material unintelligibility, matter, into an immaterial one, God. But that does not explain to my mind that unintelligibility.

Has any American an answer for all those questions? Every time I propounded them I was literally crammed with proofs out of the Bible, or sometimes out of the Koran and the Veddas! Well, I never wanted to know which was the best of Gods; but why is there a God? Surely in a Christian land like America, some minds did consider that question and resolve it satisfactorily for themselves. How they did it is what I should like to know.

It must be pretty well understood that any question of morals is to be set apart. I have since a long time observed that theists and atheists do behave very much alike in life, and that it would be very hard to discriminate them by their behavior. They conform, consciously or unconsciously, to the moral rules of the time and country they live in, and for the most part don't bother where those rules come from.

This is a rather long letter, Mr. Editor, but my excuse, as I told you, is that I lie crippled in my bed. I must also beg your very best indulgence for the poor English in which it is written; I should like better to write in French, but our language is not now for that sort of serene philosophy.

M. QUESNEY.

CLINIQUE LA PRIMEVÈRE, LEYSIN, SWITZERLAND.

[We venture to remind our friend of a saying by a great modern philosopher which may help him in his perplexity. It is as follows: "There are in man many regions more fertile and more profound than his reason or his intelligence."

—EDITOR.]

WHO STARTED SABBATH OBSERVANCE?

SIR,—Your reviewer of Dr. McConnell's *History of the American Episcopal Church* cites a passage from the book in which the author expresses

the opinion, or rather the conviction, that the proper observance of the Lord's Day is a heritage from the Presbyterians more than from the Puritans. It may be that the scrupulous regard for the Sabbath is to some extent due to Presbyterian influence; but it was certainly not the only agency. P. A. Bruce, in his *Institutional History of Virginia in the Seventeenth Century*, makes it clear by abundant citations that the people of the Old Dominion were as illiberal, if one chooses to put the case that way, as were those of New England; and they were nearly all Anglicans. Although I have not, at this moment, the work before me, I recall the author's remark that there was the largest possible liberty of action on week-days and the smallest imaginable on Sundays. Drunkenness and profanity attracted very little attention on six days of the week, but if a man had imbibed too freely of an intoxicant or so far forgot himself as to utter an oath on the seventh he was severely punished, if apprehended. 'A man must take no precautions against the ravages of a storm, if it occurred on Sunday, must not kill a noxious beast even on his own premises, or even be seen with a gun on that day. Whether we call this state of mind bigotry or conscientiousness, Mr. Bruce furnishes abundant data showing that it was by no means a characteristic of the people of New England solely. As I am not a student of Colonial history I do not know to what extent the records here drawn from have been examined before Mr. Bruce set himself to the task. Albeit, what he tells us will go far toward demonstrating that the strict observance of the Sabbath is a British rather than a Presbyterian or Puritan custom. This fact "leaps into the eye" of everybody who spends one Sunday in either England or Scotland at the present day, except in so far as it has been modified by the exigencies of the war. During the present century frequent complaint has been made, not only by church people, but also by liberals, against the increasing disregard for the Sabbath in Great Britain by foreigners and persons of foreign ancestry. There is no reason to believe that the veneration of the British people for the Sabbath is due to a reflex influence of the New country upon the Old as it has perished in the latter country ever since the time of Cromwell if not longer. Perhaps some day an expert in what the Germans call "Folk-psychology" will tell us why the Protestants and the Roman Catholics in the British Isles differ so widely in this respect from those persons professing the same faith in continental Europe. It may be remarked in this connection that the automobile has made more serious inroads on what many people regard as the proper observance of the Lord's Day than any other agency since colonial times.

CHARLES W. SOPER.

ATHENS, OHIO.

PROHIBITION IN COLORADO

SIR,—As a reader of THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW, I have been interested in the article on prohibition in Kansas, by Mr. Albert J. Nock, and also the article in the October number on "Prohibition's Legislative Efforts," by L. Ames Brown—but interested in the sense that I feel these articles do injustice to the principles of prohibition, and to the results, where it has been put in practice.

As to the results of practical prohibition, I wish to call attention to the